

1 The Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10  
11  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
14 SEATTLE DIVISION  
15

16 AMANDA SCHICK,  
17

18 Plaintiff,

19 Civil Action No. 2:20-cv-01529-BJR  
20

21 v.  
22

23 STUDENT LOAN SOLUTIONS, LLC,  
24

25 Defendant.

DEFENDANT'S SURREPLY IN  
OPPOSITION TO OBJECTION TO  
EVIDENCE AND MOTION TO STRIKE  
CONTAINED IN REPLY MEMORANDUM

16 **I. The Challenged Statements And Documents Are Admissible**

17 Plaintiff objects to, and asks the Court to strike, statements in and exhibits to Student Loans  
18 Solutions, LLC's ("SLS") and Williams & Fudge, Inc.'s ("WFI") declarations. She challenges  
19 SLS's contract with Bank of America, N.A. ("BOA"), the documents received from BOA, and  
20 WFI's payment history. These items are admissible and properly before the Court.

21 **a. The Loan Sale Agreement**

22 Plaintiff challenges SLS's authentication of the loan sale agreement, but it was signed by  
23 the same individual who executed SLS's declaration. *See* DE 22-1, pp. 8, 43. Without support,  
24 Plaintiff contends Annex I was created solely for the purpose of litigation. The contract clearly  
25 incorporates Annex I and indicates it is a computer file, and the declaration states the attachment

1 is a true and correct printout of an excerpt of the computer file. *See* DE 22-1, ¶ 8 and Ex. A, p. 49.  
2 The authentication requirements of Rule 901(b)(1) are clearly satisfied. If the person who signed  
3 a contract is not permitted to authenticate it, then no one could ever authenticate a contract.

4 **b. Bank of America Documents**

5 Plaintiff contends Mr. Ruh does not state how he comes to know the facts attested to, but  
6 he states they are based on his personal knowledge and his review of the relevant business records.  
7 DE 22-1, ¶ 2. Plaintiff appears to contend SLS cannot authenticate records acquired from BOA,  
8 but Plaintiff is mistaken. *See DZ Bank AG Deutsche Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank v. Connect Ins.*  
9 *Agency, Inc.*, 2016 WL 613574 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 16, 2016). There, the court said:

10 Under the business records exception to the hearsay rule, the proponent of the  
11 evidence must provide testimony from the custodian of the document or another  
12 “qualified witness” that satisfies three requirements: (1) “the record was made at or  
13 near the time by—or from information transmitted by—someone with knowledge”;  
14 (2) “the record was kept in the course of a regularly conducted activity of a  
15 business”; and (3) “making the record was a regular part of that activity.” Fed. R.  
16 Evid. 803(6)(A)-(D). In this circuit, however, records that a business “receives  
17 from others are admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6)” when three  
conditions are met: (1) the records are received directly from the other par[t]y and  
are kept by the recipient in the regular course of its business, (2) the records are  
relied upon by the recipient of the business, and (3) the recipient business has a  
substantial interest in the accuracy of the records.

18 *Id.* at \*16 (citing *MRT Constr., Inc. v. Harddrives, Inc.*, 158 F.3d 478, 483 (9th Cir. 1998). *See*,  
19 *also, Cage v. Cach, LLC*, 2014 WL 2170431, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. May 22, 2014) (“CACH’s  
20 decision to file debt collection actions against plaintiffs for the outstanding balance on these  
21 accounts indicates that defendants trusted and relied upon the accuracy of the records...”).

22 The BOA records meet these conditions. SLS received them directly from BOA in a non-  
23 modifiable format and deposited them with WFI, as SLS’s agent, for keeping in the regular course  
24 of business, with no subsequent data breach. *See* DE 22-1, ¶¶ 9, 29-31. Relying on the documents,  
25 SLS decided to file, and did file, suit against Plaintiff. *See* DE 22-1, ¶¶ 34-36 and DE 22-3, ¶¶ 15-

1 18. Plaintiff neither objects to nor contests this fact. SLS has a substantial interest in the accuracy  
2 of the BOA documents because attempts to collect a debt based on inaccurate documents could  
3 expose SLS to substantial potential liability under state and federal consumer statutes, as Plaintiff  
4 seeks to impose here. Under *MRT Constr.*, the documents are authenticated and admissible.

5 **c. Williams & Fudge Documents**

6 Plaintiff challenges WFI's statements based on its own internal records which it created.  
7 The documents are authenticated based on personal knowledge and review of business records by  
8 an authorized custodian. DE 22-3, ¶ 2. Without support, Plaintiff contends the documents are  
9 untrustworthy but the information regarding the account number and account balances are  
10 corroborated by documents Plaintiff produced in discovery. *See* DE 22-4, ¶ 4 and DE 22-5, pp.  
11 89-133. Plaintiff also concedes making the payments identified in WFI's records. *See* DE 19-1,  
12 ¶ 11. The documents and statements are admissible as sufficiently authenticated and trustworthy.

14 **II. The Court Should Consider The Entirety Of Defendant's Opposition**

15 Plaintiff requests the Court strike the last two pages of SLS's opposition, though she  
16 responds to the arguments therein and claims no prejudice to the court considering the pages.  
17 Although over-length briefs are disfavored and SLS did not seek permission to file an over-length  
18 brief, the Court may nevertheless consider the additional pages. *See, e.g., Puget Soundkeeper*  
19 *Alliance v. Rainier Petroleum Corp.*, 2017 WL 6515970, at \*5 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 19, 2017)  
20 (considering over-length brief where opposing party had opportunity to respond and did not allege  
21 prejudice). The Court may consider the additional pages, and SLS respectfully requests it do so.

22 This the 21st day of April, 2021.

23 Respectfully submitted,

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 /s Michael S. O'Meara  
Michael S. O'Meara/WSBA No. 41502  
Attorney for the Defendant

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on April 21, 2021, a copy of the foregoing Notice of Intent to File Surreply was filed electronically. Service of this filing will be made on all ECF-registered counsel by operation of the Court's electronic filing system, including on Plaintiff's counsel as follows:

**PARTIES SERVED:**

T. Tyler Santiago  
Jason D. Anderson  
Anderson Santiago, PLLC  
787 Maynard Ave, S  
Seattle, WA 98104

Christina L. Henry  
Henry & DeGraaff, P.S.  
787 Maynard Ave, S  
Seattle, WA 98104

/s Michael S. O'Meara  
Michael S. O'Meara/WSBA No. 41502  
Attorney for the Defendant